

REMARKS

Status of Claims:

Claims 1-47 were originally filed with the patent application. Claims 40-47 were canceled and Claims 48-55 were added in a First Preliminary Amendment dated March 15, 2004. Claims 27, 29, 53, and 55 were canceled and Claims 56-63 were added by the Amendment and Response dated December 1, 2004. No claims were canceled or added by the July 14, 2005 Amendment and Response. No claims are being canceled or added herein. Therefore, Claims 1-26, 28, 30-39, 48-52, 54, and 56-63 will still be pending upon entry of this Response.

Drawing Objections:

Applicant will file formal drawings that are prepared by a patent draftsman once a Notice of Allowance is received in relation to the above-noted patent application. Applicant is unaware of any requirement that formal drawings be provided at the time of the filing of the patent application. However, the Examiner takes the position that Figures 2, 3, 4, 5A, 5B, 6 and 7 are informal. Formal drawings are not required for examination of a pending patent application. The Examiner also indicates that "the noted figures include informal text and/or reference numerals, and are otherwise not particularly drawn." Applicant disagrees. Although Applicant readily admits that various of the drawings that were originally filed with the patent application included hand-drawn reference numerals, all reference numerals are clearly legible and the drawings otherwise comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. §1.84.

Applicant did receive a Notice to File Corrected Application Papers in relation to the original drawings not complying with the margin requirement for drawings. Notably, no other deficiencies were identified in relation to the drawings that were originally submitted. Substitute drawings were

filed with the Patent Office on February 8, 2002 having margins that complied with the regulations.
All drawings comply with the requirement of 37 C.F.R. §1.84.

In the event that the Examiner maintains the position that formal drawings are required for examination to continue, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner cite the relevant section
5 of 37 CFR. No support for the Examiner's position has yet been cited.

§112 Rejections:

The Examiner has rejected certain claims having various "means plus function" claim elements for an alleged lack of enablement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, and for alleged
10 deficiencies under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Applicant disagrees. Means plus function clauses are of course allowable under 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraph 6. The specification as filed clearly complies with 35 U.S.C. §112, paragraphs 1 and 2, in relation to the various means plus function claim elements presented in the pending claims. The original specification provides more than sufficient detail regarding the lower surface 106 of the slider body 86, starting on page 17, line 8
15 through page 24. This detail includes both relative comparisons between various individual portions of the lower surface 106 of the slider body 86, and dimensions for various individual portions of the lower surface 106 of the slider body 86. For instance, page 21, lines 3-20 provide detail regarding the transducer ABS pad 154, and specifies the size of the same both in relation to an actual size (0.00001 in² in one embodiment), and in terms of a ratio of the area of this transducer ABS pad 154
20 to the area within the perimeter of the lower surface 106 of the slider body 86 (0.004 in one embodiment). Page 21, line 21 through page 22, line 10 address the structure for pressurizing the transducer ABS pad 154. Page 22, lines 11-22, address various "relativities" for the front ABS step 118, the front ABS pad 114, the base 134 of the cavity 130, the second transducer ABS step 158b,

the first transducer ABS step 158a, the transducer ABS pad 154, the rear ABS steps 142a, 142b, and the rear ABS pads 138a, 138b. Page 22, line 22 through page 23, line 12, address "dimensional specifics" relating to the front ABS step 118, the front ABS pad 114, the base 134 of the cavity 130, the second transducer ABS step 158b, the first transducer ABS step 158a, the transducer ABS pad 154, the rear ABS steps 142a, 142b, and the rear ABS pads 138a, 138b. Page 24, lines 1-12 provides a discussion of the functional characteristics of the rear transducer ABS pad 154 (including that it generates at least about 15% of the total lifting forces exerted on the lower surface 106 of the slider body 86, and that it is pressurized to at least 400 psi in one embodiment). Page 24, lines 12-23, along with Figure 6, provide a discussion of the pressure distribution on the lower surface 106 of the slider body 86. Page 25, lines 1-18 provide further discussion of the "operation" of the transducer ABS pad 154. Finally, page 25, line 18 through page 27, line 18, along with Figure 8, provide comparative data relating to the transducer ABS pad 154.

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant respectfully requests that the various rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112 be withdrawn.

Claim 1:

The corresponding provisional application for the above-captioned patent application discloses a "highly pressurized micropad ABS design" that is pressurized to greater than 500 psi. Page 3 of the provisional application provides an image of the lower surface of a slider body having such a micropad, where by measurement the ratio of the area of this micropad to the area within the perimeter of the lower surface of the slider body is no more than about 0.004. Claim 1 is clearly supported by the provisional application. U.S. Patent No. 6,556,381 is not prior art to the provisional application. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(e) rejection be withdrawn.

Applicant of course reserves the right to respond to any subsequent rejection by filing an appropriate affidavit under 37 C.F.R. §1.131.

U.S. Patent No. 6,556,381:

Applicant notes that the surface 5a in the '381 Patent is characterized therein as not significantly affecting the floating force of the magnetic head slider. This is consistent with the provision of a deep recess immediately in front of the surface 5a (e.g., Figures 2 and 14), which would reduce the pressurization of the surface 5a.

Conclusion:

Based upon the foregoing, Applicant believes that all pending claims are in condition for allowance and such a disposition is respectfully requested. In the event that a telephone conversation would further prosecution and/or expedite allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

MARSH FISCHMANN & BREYFOGLE LLP

By: 

James L. Johnson

Registration No. 34,193

3151 South Vaughn Way, Suite 411

Aurora, Colorado 80014

(701) 293-7680

Date: 4/3/06